

Official Announcement

No. 87/2024



Published on: 4 November, 2024

Statute concerning the assurance and development of quality in teaching and learning at Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg

dated October 24, 2024

On the basis of the applicable versions of § 5a in conjunction with § 7, §7a of the Saxony-Anhalt Higher Education Act dated 1 July, 2021 (Law & Ordinance Gazette LSA 368, 369), Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg has enacted the following statute concerning the assurance and development of quality in teaching and learning:

PREAMBLE	2
I General Provisions.....	3
§ 1 Scope	3
§ 2 Subject and Objectives	3
II Responsibility and Powers.....	4
§ 3 Basic Principles	4
§ 4 Participants.....	4
III Tools	5
§ 5 Principles of Continuous Quality Assessment	5
§ 6 Catalog of Quality Criteria in Teaching and Learning	6
§ 7 Study Program Meetings and Conferences	6
§ 8 Analysis of Study Program-Specific Data	7
§ 9 Teaching Evaluation and Surveys	8
§ 10 Quality Cycle and Quality Cycle Reports	9
IV Proceedings and Legal Consequences	9
§ 11 Introduction, Major Changes to and Closure of a Study Program	9
§ 12 Legal Consequences and Complaint Procedure	10
§ 13 Reflection.....	11
V Final Provisions.....	11
§ 14 Data Protection.....	11
§ 15 Entry into Force; Repeal	11

PREAMBLE

Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg considers quality in teaching and learning to be the entirety of academic education, consisting of relaying specialist technical content, opening up space for skills development and the taking on of responsibility, respectful interaction with one another and striving to continuously develop teaching and learning through participation opportunities and processes of reflection and design. All members of the university are committed to this understanding of quality and actively shape the shared quality culture. The university trusts in the high intrinsic commitment of all those involved in teaching and learning and is satisfied of their professional expertise. It supports the willingness to undertake individual training and development and the enables structures and processes for continuous quality assurance and development in teaching and learning. On the basis of this understanding and the fact that the university constantly evaluates the quality of teaching and learning by means of binding processes and responsibilities, all study programs in the quality development system are considered to be quality assessed.

I General Provisions

§ 1

Scope

The statute governs the procedure for assuring, developing and evaluating quality in teaching and learning for Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg.

§ 2

Subject and Objectives

- (1) Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg follows its mission statement and guidelines for teaching and learning and complies with national as well as internationally applicable directives such as the Interstate Treaty on the Accreditation of Studies, the Saxony-Anhalt Regulation Governing the Accreditation of Studies, the rules of the Accreditation Council and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.
- (2) Quality assurance and development contribute, by means of closed and interdependent control systems, to the continuous improvement of the framework conditions and curricula as well as to ensuring academic success. Dialog, surveys and data-supported monitoring constitute the foundation for assessing quality in teaching and learning, for identifying strengths and weaknesses and for deriving and implementing relevant measures.
- (3) The university-wide system of assurance and development of quality in teaching and learning is valuable, in particular, for
 - reflecting upon academic success,
 - further developing teaching taking into account changing regional and global requirements as well as the concept of lifelong learning,
 - setting qualification objectives with a view to scientific and professional competences as well as personality development taking into account the diversity of the members of the university,
 - increasing the international visibility of OVGU and its attractiveness as a place in which to learn and work (internationalization) for domestic and international students and employees as well as
 - implementing efforts to internationalize OVGU at study program level (mobility)
- (4) The quality development system and its effectiveness are continually evaluated and further developed by all participants under the responsibility of the President's Office through nationwide and international exchange in particular with existing networks, such as the network of medium-sized universities, with cooperating universities and at relevant conferences and meetings.
- (5) The quality assurance and development measures are to be organized in such a way that all member groups of the university and external dialog partners from science and professional practice as well as graduates are involved in the design process without being disadvantaged as a result.

II RESPONSIBILITY AND POWERS

§ 3

Basic Principles

- (1) The responsibility for the quality measures in relation to teaching and learning is borne by the Faculty Councils and Deans' Offices as well as the Senate and the President's Office.
- (2) The power to organize teaching and learning falls at a decentralized level to the Faculty, and in particular the respective Dean of Studies and centrally to the President's Office, and in particular the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The resulting tasks can be delegated for the purposes of operational coordination both centrally and at decentralized level to quality officers.

§ 4

Participants

- (1) The central participants are
 - a) the Senate, which rules on the study programs remaining in the quality development system. At least once in the quality cycle it also decides upon the effectiveness and further development of the system and any resulting adjustments to the tools and applicable quality criteria that may need to be made,
 - b) the Senate Committee for Academic Affairs (KSL), which evaluates compliance with the quality criteria in the study programs and prepares resolutions for the Senate,
 - c) the President's Office and in particular the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who reports to the Senate, usually once a year, about the developments and measures in the faculties and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the quality development system and its evolution,
 - d) the Central Quality Officer of the university (ZQB), who assists the faculties with quality processes and supports their implementation, leads the Quality Officers' Working Group in accordance with para. 5 and coordinates the evaluation of the effectiveness of the quality development system and its evolution. The role of the ZQB is structurally allocated to the head of the Quality Assurance staff unit in the Department of Academic Affairs; their tasks may be delegated to several individuals and
 - e) the Student Quality Officers of the university (SQB), who are designated by the Student Council. The Student Council sets out further details on this in its regulations. The position may also be held by several individuals.
- (2) The decentralized participants are
 - a) the Faculty Council, which issues implementation rules for the faculty's own control systems, and in particular decision-making processes, competencies and responsibilities,
 - b) the Dean's Office and in particular the Dean of Studies who is responsible for the quality processes in the faculty,
 - c) the professor responsible for the study program, who is responsible for utilizing the tools mentioned in Section III and the development, implementation and evaluation of the measures plus the drawing up of the quality cycle report for their study program,

- d) the Faculty Quality Officer (FQB) who coordinates the tasks and execution of the processes in the context of this statute as well as all quality processes in their own faculty's study programs, especially the use of the tools mentioned in Section III and supports the implementing of measures. Structurally, the role of the FQB is allocated to the Dean of Studies; the tasks of the FQB can be assigned to more than one individual.
 - e) the Faculty Student Quality Officer (FSQB) who should be appointed by the Faculty Council, and who supports the quality processes in the faculty from the student perspective.
- (3) The other participants are
- a) the Center for Teacher Education (ZLB) in the case of study programs with relevance to the teaching profession, which coordinates the quality assurance and development processes of these programs. To this end, the faculties responsible for teacher education and the ZLB jointly adopt separate implementation rules which will be acknowledged by all faculties. For this, the ZLB will appoint a Quality Officer for Teacher Education (LQB),
 - b) the Center for Continuing Scientific Education (ZWW) in the case of the continuing education programs, to the extent that it is involved in these and
 - c) the central administrative units of the university, to the extent that they undertake quality-related tasks in the field of teaching and learning.
- (4) The partners are
- a) the members of Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg,
 - b) cooperating universities in the case of study programs that are relevant to them
 - c) institutions outside of higher education that work with Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg on teaching and learning and
 - d) the representatives from science and professional practice, graduates, external students of other universities and, where applicable for regulated study programs, the responsible ministries.
- (5) The Central Quality Officers (ZQB and SQB) and those of the faculties and teacher education plus, as warranted, further participants form a working group (AG QB) for continuous dialog, which as a rule meets monthly. In addition, the student quality officers at the central and decentralized levels exchange thoughts at least once per semester.

III TOOLS

§ 5

Principles of Continuous Quality Assessment

- (1) The tools of the quality development system generate information about content, conditions and organization in teaching and learning. They create a communication stimulus towards direct exchange about and further development of the curricula, individual teaching quality and learning behavior.
- (2) The following tools are used continuously:
 - a) the catalog of quality criteria in teaching and learning,
 - b) study program meetings and conferences,
 - c) analysis of program-specific data,
 - d) teaching evaluation and surveys on teaching and learning,
 - e) quality cycle reports.

§ 6

Catalog of Quality Criteria in Teaching and Learning

- (1) The catalog of quality criteria in teaching and learning in Annex 1 reflects the guidelines and legal requirements for the quality development system in accordance with § 2 para. 1 and thus constitutes the basic tool for ongoing support of the processes in the faculties and for the further development of the study programs. This catalog is continuously evaluated and any adjustments that are needed are undertaken as a rule once during the quality cycle of the university by its central bodies. This excludes adjustments that must be undertaken in a more timely fashion on the basis of changes to underlying specifications and laws. The relevant current version is published in the Official Announcements of the university.
- (2) For regulated study programs, the criteria are adapted in accordance with the applicable regulations for these study programs.
- (3) The quality criteria are taken into account in the design of study programs upon introduction and when drawing up program documentation. The formal criteria are checked upon introduction, whilst the academic criteria are taken into account on a conceptual basis. During the first quality cycle of a study program, it is assumed that, based on the small amount of experiential information available at this point in time from actual day-to-day delivery of the study program, it will not be possible to comprehensively evaluate all academic criteria. The non-applicable criteria and the academic criteria that can only be assessed conceptually on the basis of the study documentation are marked accordingly in the quality criteria catalog.
- (4) The study program meetings and conferences on the further development of the study programs are based, in particular, on the academic criteria. All other criteria are evaluated by the decentralized and central quality officers and are taken into account as appropriate or if applicable.
- (5) The assessment of the academic criteria by the external participants in accordance with § 4 para. 4 d) must be adequately documented. This can be done in the minutes of the study program conference or by means of a separate document as an addendum to the minutes. The principle applies that criteria shall be deemed to have been satisfied if they are not addressed or criticized.

§ 7

Study Program Meetings and Conferences

- (1) Study program meetings and conferences are the forum at OVGU for continuously evaluating study programs on the basis of survey results, data analyses and program-related assessments by the participants as well as by means of the quality criteria. The faculties at the university are responsible for organizing the study program meetings and conferences. The involvement of expertise from university didactics and research is advised as appropriate. Several study programs can be combined in a cluster.
- (2) Study program meetings are conducted within the faculty as warranted, however, at least every two years. Every student cohort must be allowed to participate at least once per quality cycle. The meeting is open to university members with the participation of
 - the professor responsible for the study program,
 - at least two teachers (of whom at least one must be a university lecturer)
 - at least two students from the relevant study program.

Further participants in accordance with § 4, and in particular representatives of the Dean's Office, FQB, FSQB and lecturers from import modules may also be called upon in

case of need. The FQB will be notified of the holding of the study program meeting and the minutes will be forwarded to him or her afterwards.

- (3) The study program conference is held as appropriate, however at least once per quality cycle. The conference is open to university members with the participation of
- the professor responsible for the study program,
 - at least two teachers (of whom at least one must be a university lecturer)
 - at least two students from the relevant study program,
 - a representative of the Dean's Office,
 - the responsible decentralized, central and student quality officers
 - at least one graduate of the relevant study program,
 - at least one subject representative at professorial level from another university,
 - at least one representative from professional practice who is not a member of the university and
 - at least one student from outside the university.

In the case of study programs in which they are involved, the Centers for Teacher Education and Continuing Scientific Education and the institutions outside of higher education that cooperate with the university are authorized to participate pursuant to § 4 paras. 3 and 4. In the case of cooperative study programs, representatives from the cooperating universities must also be able to participate appropriately. Further participants pursuant to § 4 may be called upon in case of need. The faculties themselves set out further details on this in their regulations. The impartiality and discretion of the external participants shall be ensured accordingly. This is regulated in more detail in guidelines.

The study program conference may replace a study program meeting.

- (4) The dates of the study program meetings and conferences are announced within the university in the appropriate manner. All of the participants mentioned in section 2 or 3 shall be invited to participate taking into account a minimum 2-week notice period in the case of study program meetings or 4 weeks in the case of study program conferences. The invitation shall include the agenda. In the case of study program conferences, in addition to the meeting documentation including at least analyses of program-specific data (in accordance with § 8), estimations regarding the capacity utilization of the study program, evaluation and/or survey results and an overview of the developments during the quality cycle (esp. monitoring of measures), shall be made available to all participants at least two weeks before the date of the meeting.
- (5) In the case of teaching imports, the corresponding exporting faculties must be involved appropriately and informed via the Dean's Office.
- (6) If any person whose participation is required does not take part, for example due to short notice inability to attend, they must participate in another manner in the quality cycle concerned, for example by means of written assessment. They must also have the relevant meeting documentation made available to them.
- (7) The results of the study program meetings and conferences shall be drawn up by the FQB and must also be made available to the relevant Dean's Office in addition to the ZQB and the SQB.

§ 8

Analysis of Study Program-Specific Data

For the further development of the study programs, program-specific data are used in a criteria-led way, which are generated from the results of central and decentralized surveys as well as university statistics and other data from teaching and learning, whilst preserving

anonymity and data protection. To this end, the faculties have the following data made available to them:

- applicants (at least origin, gender, form of admission entitlement)
- enrolled students (at least origin, gender, form of admission entitlement)
- progress of the cohorts (at least semester of study, semester at the university, program status, change of study program, university leavers)
- examination progress (at least exam grades, exam attempts)
- graduates (at least final grades, final semester of study)

§ 9

Teaching Evaluation and Surveys

- (1) The faculties and the Language Center are responsible for the preparation, execution and evaluation of the decentralized surveys regarding the courses and/or modules (teaching evaluation). The responsibility for the tasks arising can be passed to the FQB. The faculties and the Language Center regulate the use of the available tools themselves in accordance with their departmental culture and the course format. Teaching evaluation falls within the responsibility of the faculty/unit offering the teaching, including in the case of teaching exports.

The KSL shall decide upon a core questionnaire for evaluating courses which is used by all faculties/units and may be supplemented according to subject needs.

- (2) Moreover, the university shall also regularly conduct central surveys of the students on their study program and progress, changes of program and exmatriculation as well as surveys of graduates, and shall also participate in regional, national and international higher education surveys and rankings.
- (3) The faculties and the Language Center evaluate each course and each module in a rotating system at least every three semesters. Upon informal application by the students and teachers, the quality of a course and module may also be assessed outside of the survey cycle in the respective semester.
- (4) The faculties and the Language Center specify the minimum number of participants above which courses and modules may be assessed in writing. In order to preserve the anonymity of the students surveyed, the regulations specify that if the number of respondents falls below a minimum of 10 that the report into the written evaluation will not contain any evaluation of the organizational information concerning those surveyed (e.g. study program, semester of study). If, due to low numbers of participants, no written evaluation is carried out, the teacher is responsible for carrying out and documenting an evaluation in an alternative, appropriate format and for passing the results to the Dean of Studies.
- (5) The Dean of Studies and the lecturers responsible or, in the Faculty of Medicine (FME) the subject representatives responsible for teaching, receive the results of the decentralized surveys. The lecturer uses the results to individually improve their teaching and, as warranted, as a stimulus for development meetings with the students and colleagues. To support the teachers, the university makes available a program to develop didactic and methodological skills. The evaluation results of imported modules are to be made available to the importing faculty upon application by the Dean of Studies excluding the teaching staff-related data in the evaluation report.
- (6) The university supports the faculties and the Language Center in the conducting of decentralized surveys in teaching and learning. To this end, a centralized system is made available for electronic evaluation. Personal details are deleted after three years or one

semester after the lecturer has left the service of OVGU.

§ 10

Quality Cycle and Quality Cycle Reports

- (1) The quality cycle comprises the period during which all quality criteria are processed and evaluated at least once and lasts in total for a maximum of eight years. The quality cycles of all study programs must be staggered so that overall they are distributed as evenly as possible across the accreditation period of the university.
- (2) Once during the quality cycle a cycle meeting will take place between study program coordinators, the FQB, ZQB and if necessary any other participants in accordance with § 4 paras. 2 and 3. The SQB and FSQB will be invited to take part. The cycle meeting takes place no later than three months before the study program conference. The meeting agenda will include, in particular, the development of the study program in the current quality cycle, including data analyses and the current level of compliance with the quality criteria.
- (3) The ZQB will remind the faculty twelve months before the end of the quality cycle. Should it become evident that it will not be possible to fulfill the quality criteria and/or produce the quality cycle report within the deadline prescribed by para. 4, a planning meeting will be held between the faculty and the ZQB. Should this not take place, the ZQB will notify the President's Office, which will then hold further meetings with the faculty.
- (4) By no less than nine months or, in the case of a newly introduced study program four months, before the end of the quality cycle the faculties shall produce, based on a central template, an internal quality cycle report for each study program, which satisfies the requirements of the study accreditation regulations and thus in particular includes an audit of the processing and evaluation of all quality criteria. The report, supplemented by a statement collated in a separate document by the central and – where appointed – student quality officer, will be approved by the Senate. The external quality cycle report produced on this basis will be cleared by the faculty for publication and published in the database of the Accreditation Council.
- (5) The quality cycle may be extended once by up to twelve months. The application, supplemented by a statement from the ZQB, must be addressed to the KSL and justified in writing and must also include a schedule. The application must be submitted at least nine months before expiration of the quality cycle and must be decided upon by the Senate.

IV PROCEEDINGS AND LEGAL CONSEQUENCES

§ 11

Introduction, Significant Changes to and Closure of a Study Program

- (1) Upon introduction of a study program, the quality criteria are audited by the central quality officer and documented in a summary record. Based on the positive audit the Senate authorizes the acceptance of the study program into the quality development system. Notwithstanding § 10 para. 1, the first quality cycle ends upon expiration of the standard study period of the first cohort. Notwithstanding § 7 para. 3 it continues to be the case that graduates may not be considered. The study program conference may be replaced by a study program meeting with the participation of the central and student quality officers and a written survey to assess the fulfillment of the academic criteria of the study program by in each case at least one representative of the group of

- professorial subject representatives from other universities and
 - representatives from professional practice who are not members of the university and
 - external students.
- (2) If a significant change to a study program is not the outcome of a quality measure, then when the amending resolution is passed, the Senate must be involved in ruling upon the faculty's proposals for the timescale and way in which this change is to be evaluated. A change is considered to be significant in the following cases:
- if the study program name is changed,
 - if the final degree is changed,
 - if the name of the final degree is changed,
 - if the type of Master's degree is changed,
 - if the program of study or teaching qualification type is changed,
 - in the event of a change to the form of study,
 - if the standard study duration is changed,
 - if the study venue is changed,
 - in the event of a change to the total ECTS points.

In each case, a reassessment of the applicable quality criteria must be undertaken by the faculty.

- (3) If a study program is to be closed, the Senate must participate in the decision as to whether or not the study program should remain in the quality development system of OVGU until cessation of the program independently of the individual quality cycle. Where the final quality cycle report was produced longer ago than a standard study duration, following the ruling regarding the closure of the study program, a final quality cycle report must be produced.

§ 12

Legal Consequences and Complaint Procedure

- (1) If it becomes apparent from the evaluation that during the quality cycle the quality criteria were not processed or positively evaluated, the Senate will, upon recommendation of the KSL, rule either individually or cumulatively on the following measures:
- a) request for documents
 - b) recommendation with request for a statement
 - c) obligation with deadline for fulfillment
 - d) exclusion of the study program from the quality development system of OVGU.
- (2) A deadline will be set for the corresponding implementation of the measures decided upon and this will be monitored by the ZQB. The deadline for fulfilling an obligation shall amount to no more than twelve months. This deadline may be extended once by three months. The application for extension must be addressed to the KSL and approved by the Senate. If a deadline for fulfilling an obligation is not met, the study program will be excluded from the quality development system in accordance with para. 1 d) in conjunction with para. 3, unless the faculty is demonstrably not responsible for the reasons for non-compliance.
- (3) The Senate may exclude a study program from the quality development system within twelve months upon recommendation by the KSL or following an application by the relevant faculty. Before this deadline expires, the relevant faculty must have the study program successfully independently audited using its own financial means by an Accreditation Council or equivalent quality assurance procedure as prescribed by the Higher Education Act. If this audit is not undertaken or the outcome is negative, the Senate will rule

upon the closure of the study program.

- (4) The faculty may submit a substantiated complaint against the decision of the Senate in accordance with § 12 para. 1 and para. 3 within four weeks, together with an application for the Senate to reconsider its decision. The complaint must be dealt with by no later than the second regular session of the Senate after receipt.

§ 13

Reflection

- (5) Every year, together with the quality officers' working group, the KSL reflects upon and evaluates the conceptual quality criteria and quality development system based on the regular reporting by the faculties.
- (6) The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall, once per OVGU quality cycle which is aligned with the system accreditation period, produce a report into the quality development system, which in particular will reflect upon its effectiveness, any measures carried out and its evaluation. The report will be written with the involvement of the faculties, the central and student quality officers and external participants. This will be approved by the Senate.

V FINAL PROVISIONS

§ 14

Data Protection

The recording and processing of data shall be on the basis and within the framework of the applicable versions of the Saxony–Anhalt Data Protection Act and the Saxony–Anhalt Higher Education Act.

§ 15

Entry into Force; Repeal

The Statute Concerning the Assurance and Development of Quality in Teaching and Learning at Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg shall enter into force by resolution of the Senate dated 23 October, 2024 on the day after its publication in the Official Announcements of Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg.

At the same time the Statute Concerning Quality Assurance in Teaching and Learning at Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg dated 16 September, 2020 shall be repealed.

Magdeburg, 24 October, 2024

Prof. Dr.–Ing. Jens Strackeljan
President
of Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg

Annex
[Catalog of Quality Criteria in Teaching and Learning](#)